

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,236	01/11/2002	George M. Halow	15345.4002	4880
64004 7590 04/17/2009 STRASBURGER & PRICE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET			EXAMINER	
			PORTER, RACHEL L	
SUITE 4400 DALLAS, TX	75202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte GEORGE HALOW & LOUIS ZUNIGA

Appeal 2007-4550 Application 10/042,236 Technology Center 3600

Mailed: April 17, 2009

Before DALE M. SHAW, Chief Appeals Administrator

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on July 31, 2007. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No. 2007-4550 was assigned on September 29, 2007. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Application 10/042,236

Claims 13-21 of the instant application are set forth as method claims that may not fall with one of the four statutory categories of invention recited in 35 U.S.C. § 101. On May 15, 2008, the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examining Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled "Clarification of "Processes" under 35 U.S.C. § 101." This memorandum is further used in conjunction with the Interim Guidelines and the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2106.IV.B, when determining whether a claimed invention falls within a statutory category of invention. See In re Bilski, 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008)(en banc). Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 13-21 meet the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 13-21 meet the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DMS/tdl

Strasburger & Price, LLP 901 Main Street Suite 4400 Dallas, TX 75202